REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action dated November 3, 2005. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-17 are under consideration in this application. Claims 2, 7, 10 and 13-14 are being amended, as set forth above and in the attached marked-up presentation of the claim amendments, in order to more particularly define and distinctly claim Applicants' invention.

All the amendments to the claims are supported by the specification. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 on the grounds of being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,724 to Bruce et al. (hereinafter "Bruce"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,695,204 to Stinson et al. (hereinafter "Stinson"). These rejections have been carefully considered, but are most respectfully traversed.

The computer-implemented (including computer managers, computer terminals, databases and a network shown in Fig. 1) form processing system of the invention (for example, the embodiment depicted in Fig. 1), as now recited in claim 1, comprising: a management system 203 of form identification dictionary including a manager 111 of form identification dictionary for creating and managing a form identification dictionary 112 for identifying a type of a printed form (e.g., the bill shown in Fig. 3; "*ruled lines/frames printed on the form*" paragraph [0005] of the corresponding US Pub. No. 2002/0065847); and a plurality of form processing terminals 121, each of said form processing terminals 121 having a form identification dictionary 122 for identifying the type of the form, and identifying the form to process the form. The management system 111 of form identification dictionary and said plurality of form processing terminals 121 are interconnected via a network 101. The

form processing terminal 121, upon occurrence of failure in identification of the form based on said form identification dictionary 122 of said form processing terminal 121 itself, transmits image information of the form to said management system 111 of form identification dictionary. In particular, said management system 111 of form identification dictionary, when the form type of said image information of the form transmitted from said form processing terminal 121 has not yet been registered in said form identification dictionary 112 of said manager 111 of form identification dictionary ("*When the decision in step 502 results in that the form type of the inputted form image is not registered in the master of form identification dictionary 112*" [0053]), **creates information for identifying the type of the form**("*As the form identification information, ... for example, such information as the size or dimension of form sheet, information about ruled lines/frames printed on the form, character strings representing the title of the form, etc.*" [0005]), stores the created information in said form identification dictionary 112 of said manager 111 of form identification dictionary, and **transmits the created information to said form processing terminal 121**.

The last paragraphs of other independent claims (claim 6 reciting the management system of claim 1, claim 10 reciting the form processing terminal of claim 1, and claim 13 recited a method implemented by the form processing system of claim 1) recite a similar feature.

In essence, when the terminal/system fails to identify the type of the printed form, i.e., a new printed form, it adds the new printed form into the form identification dictionary 112 or revises/updates an existing form. The invention changes the form identification information (to be used to identify form types) to cope with a vast number of kinds of new formats and printed forms. The identification dictionary is a dictionary containing information used for identification of form types, e.g., Figs. 3-4. It contains information for identifying the type of the form, such as the size or dimension of form sheet, information about ruled lines/frames printed on the form, character strings representing the title of the form, etc. ([0005]), but not any elements to be filled in by individual users and would be different with each of the printed forms of the same type, such as "ICHIRO SUZUKI" (the actual name) or "AUG. 1999" (what might be called the content). It is this information for identifying the type of the form that is the object of "updating" in the dictionary stored in both the management system 111 and the form processing terminal 121.

Applicants respectfully contend that none of the cited prior art references teaches or suggests "when said image information of the printed form transmitted from said form processing terminal has not yet been registered in said printed form identification dictionary, **creating information for identifying the type of the printed form**, storing the created information in said form identification dictionary, and **transmitting the created information to said form processing terminal**" as in the invention.

In contrast, Bruce only processes an existing information form, such as a postal change of an address form 3575 (Abstract; col. 3, lines 42-43), but NOT ***automatically*** adding a new printed form type in a form identification dictionary, ***whenever*** a new form is identified as not yet registered in the form identification dictionary. Bruce only processes ONE such address change form format 3575, which does not constitute a "form identification dictionary" that contains a plurality of form types/formats. Even if, arguendo, Bruce's system inherently has a dictionary for storing several forms 3575, 3575z, etc. (col. 1, lines 11-15), Bruce simply does NOT *automatically* add a new printed form in the dictionary, whenever a user arbitrarily sent in a new form he/she creates. If so, it will cause an unnecessary burden to the postal operation system. At most, the postal office ***occasionally*** adopts a new Change of Address form into the dictionary, which, in no way, could be automatically created whenever one user arbitrarily adopts a new form.

As Bruce does not "*automatically* add a new printed form type in a form identification dictionary, *whenever* a new form is identified as not yet registered in the form identification dictionary", Bruce does not "**update**" the form identification dictionary stored in both the management system and the form processing terminal by "transmitting the created information from the management system to the form processing terminal" as the invention.

In addition, Bruce's NCOA database appears to store only the contents (i.e., address data) of the forms, but not any form identification information. A computer database is usually dedicated to store one kind of data such that the NCOA database stores either data of form identification information (which is not the case here), or to store address data extracted form the COA forms (which is the case). Bruce merely identifies and then updates hand-written ("*those inevitable persons who cannot stay [write] inside the lines*" col. 4, lines 25-26) or printed address data (rather than any "form or information for identifying the type of the form, such as a size or dimensions of a form sheet and information of ruled lines/frames printed on the form") to be stored in a National Change of Address (NCOA) database (col. 2, lines 61-64). Bruce's OCR software merely identifies characters/texts but not any printed

form type, such as a size or dimensions of a form sheet and information of ruled lines/frames printed on the form. The NCOA address database is essentially different from the printed form identification dictionary of the invention, since the NCOA database cannot be referred to in order to perform form analysis regarding a size or dimensions of a form sheet and information of ruled lines/frames printed on the form. Naturally, Bruce has no need to and does not transmit the updated address data back to the scanner. As admitted by the Examiner, Bruce does not teach transmitting the created information to said form processing terminal (p. 4, lines 8-9 of the outstanding office action.

Moreover, rather than **extracting** printed "forms" thereby creating "information for identifying the type of the form (such as a size or dimensions of a form sheet and information of ruled lines/frames printed on the form)" as does the invention, Bruce's "*OCR software **ignores** the preprinted data on the form* (col. 4, line 27)," and is only directed to addresses written or printed by a user. It is well established that a rejection based on cited references having principles that teach away from the invention is improper.

Stinson was relied upon by the Examiner to teach transmitting the created information to said form processing terminal. However the check cashing unit only accepts existing check forms, but not accepting any new check form such that it does not create any "information for identifying the type of the form (such as a size or dimensions of a form sheet and information of ruled lines/frames printed on the form)".

Applicants contend that neither Bruce, Stinson, nor their combination teaches or discloses each and every feature of the present invention as disclosed in independent claims 1, 6, 10 and 13. As such, the present invention as now claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the rejections raised in the Office Action. The withdrawal of the outstanding prior art rejections is in order, and is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art reference upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely, Applicants respectfully contend that the prior art references cannot anticipate the present invention or render the present invention obvious. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Stanley P. Fisher
Registration Number 24,344

Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

REED SMITH LLP
3110 Fairview Park Drive, Suite 1400
Falls Church, Virginia 22042
(703) 641-4200

February 3, 2006

SPF/JCM/JT